

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/561,220	RONEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CATHY K. WORLEY	1638	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) CATHY K. WORLEY.

(3) _____

(2) Martin Moynihan.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 October 2008

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Cathy K. Worley/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner left a telephone message with Martin Moynihan indicating that due to a typographical error in the previous Examiner's Amendment, a new Examiner's Amendment would be sent. This does not change the scope of allowed material or claims, it merely corrects a typographical error in the previous Examiner's Amendment. Martin Moynihan returned the phone call and left a message that he received the Examiner's telephone message and would be expecting the new Examiner's Amendment.